

**SOURCE SELECTION STATEMENT
FOR
SOLUTIONS FOR ENTERPRISE WIDE PROCUREMENT (SEWP) V
CATEGORY B, GROUP B (HUBZone)**

On March 5, 2015, I convened with other officials from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (“NASA”), Goddard Space Flight Center (“GSFC”) and NASA Headquarters to hear the Source Evaluation Board (“SEB”) present its proposal evaluation findings for the Solutions for Enterprise-Wide Procurement (SEWP) V competitive procurement. My decision on selection of the successful offerors for **Category B, Group B, Historically Underutilized Business Zones (HUBZone) Small Business Set-Aside**, is set forth in this statement, and supersedes my selection statement dated October 6, 2014.

PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION

The SEWP V procurement is for a Government-wide Agency Contract (“GWAC”) to provide Information Technology (“IT”) products, services, and solutions to the entire Federal sector. This procurement activity is the fifth iteration of SEWP, and is a follow-on to the SEWP IV contracts. The principal purpose of the SEWP V contracts is to provide state-of-the-art computer technologies, high-end scientific and engineering processing capabilities, peripherals, and network equipment. SEWP V will continue to provide a Government-wide capability to gain access to leading edge IT; provide direct access to IT products and services that are aligned with high-end technical requirements; optimize productivity through utilization of powerful computer systems, state of the art supporting peripherals and software on standardized but customizable systems; and ensure the availability of reliable and affordable IT to Federal agencies.

The goal of the SEWP V RFP is to provide NASA and other Federal agencies with the widest range of IT product solutions. Specifically, the SEWP V Statement of Work (“SOW”) states the acquisition objectives as: (1) to have hardware and software available to address an increasingly difficult, complex, and changing set of NASA-specific scientific and engineering problems while also providing IT product-based solutions to assist all Federal Agencies in meeting their IT needs; (2) to assist the Government in minimizing incompatibilities and maximizing strategic decision making across the IT infrastructure; (3) to provide NASA with a wide range of IT, communications, audio-visual and related hardware, software and product based services to support, interconnect, and enhance NASA’s scientific and engineering capabilities, recognizing that to promote and stimulate vendor competitiveness, SEWP V contractors must provide access and/or support to the widest possible variety of appropriate companies; and (4) to utilize innovative procurement transactions and processes to facilitate processes that will place a minimal administrative burden on the customer, contractor, and the Government. SOW C.1.1.3 further emphasizes the importance of competition under SEWP V in providing customers the best value when acquiring products and services, stating:

Overall, this consolidated effort will provide the Government with hardware, software, Audio-Visual products and related services that represent the best overall value to the Government in fulfilling its mission. Further, this effort will minimize the Government's administrative costs, and provide the ability to fulfill our users' needs in a timely manner. Because the scientific and engineering requirements depend on interoperability and standards, combined with the broad base of commonality among requirements, functions, and available COTS solutions, it is assumed that overlap will exist between contracts and across groups. Additionally, any overlap will ensure that end-users will have access to appropriate and complete solutions to meet their varied requirements. Therefore, no single contract will have exclusive rights to provide any given technology nor will end-users be confined in their choice of contracts they utilize. The end-user's decisions will be based on a Best Value and Fair Opportunity determination as required in FAR 16.505(b).

This acquisition was conducted under Federal Acquisition Regulation ("FAR") Part 12, incorporating source selection procedures in FAR Part 15, including use of the trade-off process described in FAR 15.101-1, as appropriate. The RFP notified offerors that the Government intended to evaluate proposals and award contracts without discussions.

This procurement will result in multiple, Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity ("IDIQ") contract awards, under which the Government may issue Firm Fixed Price ("FFP") delivery orders for commercial items. The contracts will have a five-year base ordering period and one five-year option period. The minimum amount of supplies or services that shall be ordered is \$25.00 with a maximum value of \$20 Billion for each contract.

The SEWP V RFP provided for multiple competition groups. Each group had specific requirements and functional tasks associated with the products and services offered within that group. There were two full and open competitions and three small business set-aside competitions as detailed below:

Category A, Computer Systems/Servers – NAICS 334111 with a size standard of 1,000 employees

- Group A: Computer Based Systems (Full and Open Competition)

Category B, Complementary Products – NAICS 541519 with a size standard of 150 employees

- Group B: Mass Storage Devices (Service Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business ("SDVOSB") Set-Aside)
- Group B: Mass Storage Devices (Historically Underutilized Business Zones ("HUBZone") Small Business Set-Aside)
- Group C: Server Support Devices / Multi-Functional Devices (Small Business Set-Aside)

- Group D: Networking / Security /Video and Conference Tools (Full and Open Competition)

This source selection statement addresses my decision for Category B, Group B (HUBZone), Mass Storage Devices.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The evaluation was conducted in accordance with the source selection procedures identified in FAR 15.3 and NASA FAR Supplement ("NFS") 1815.3, and the SEWP V RFP evaluation criteria. The RFP defined the evaluation factors as Management/Technical Approach, Price, and Past Performance. Past Performance was evaluated on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis. The RFP specified the relative order of importance of the remaining evaluation factors as follows:

The Management/Technical Approach Factor is approximately equal in importance to the Price Factor.

The RFP provided that each offeror's Management/Technical Approach proposal would be evaluated and point scored. This procedure required the Government to evaluate proposals under each subfactor, identifying Significant Strengths, Strengths, Significant Weaknesses, Weaknesses, and Deficiencies; to assign an adjectival rating for each subfactor based on the findings; to determine a percentile score for each subfactor; and to calculate a total Management/Technical Approach Factor point score using the weighted sum of subfactor scores. The Management/Technical Approach Factor consisted of the following three subfactors with points assigned as indicated:

1. Excellence of Proposed Systems (Subfactor A)	300 points
2. Offeror's Support and Commitment (Subfactor B)	250 points
3. Management Plan (Subfactor C)	<u>450 points</u>
Total: 1000 points	

The RFP notified offerors of the areas that would be evaluated under each subfactor. For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the RFP described how the Government would evaluate offerors' proposed systems; the breadth and depth of proposed available components; the extent to which offerors exceeded minimum specifications; and how other features proposed by offerors enhanced suitability for the group and supported Government initiatives and policies. For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the RFP addressed how the Government would evaluate offerors' commitment to supply chain diversity and offerors' proposed plans for providing post award support and service. Finally, for Subfactor C, the RFP explained how the Government would evaluate offerors' approaches to program management and data interchange.

Regarding the Price Factor, the RFP stated that a price analysis would be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(1) to ensure that the Government paid a fair and

reasonable price. The RFP also stated that price would be evaluated in accordance with the provided pricing model and would not be point scored.

Within the Past Performance Factor, the RFP provided that each offeror's recent and relevant past performance history for ongoing or completed contracts within three years of the proposal due date would be evaluated on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis. Under this factor, an offeror with relevant and acceptable performance information within three years of the proposal due date would be evaluated as "Acceptable." An offeror with no relevant record of past performance would also be evaluated as "Acceptable." An offeror would be evaluated as "Unacceptable," and therefore would not be eligible for contract award, if its relevant past performance history within three years of the proposal due date reflected significant adverse performance issues.

EVALUATION PROCESS

NASA's Source Selection Authority ("SSA") for this procurement appointed the SEB, comprised of members from appropriate disciplines, to evaluate all proposals against the detailed evaluation criteria contained in the RFP. NASA issued the RFP on August 16, 2013. During the course of this procurement, the Contracting Officer ("CO") issued 12 amendments. Within Category B, Group B (HUBZone), NASA received 21 proposals. Of these, NASA eliminated two proposals as unacceptable. SBA also found one offeror to be ineligible for a HUBZone award. The following 18 proposals were acceptable and fully evaluated:

- 4 Star Technologies (4 Star)
- Akira Technologies, Inc. (Akira)
- American 4G, Inc. (American 4G)
- Anacapa Micro Products, Inc. (Anacapa)
- BAHFed Corporation (BAHFed)
- Better Direct (Better Direct)
- Blue Tech, Inc. (Blue Tech)
- DH Technologies, LLC (DH)
- FedBiz IT Solutions, LLC (FedBiz)
- GovSmart, Inc. (GovSmart)
- MVS, Inc. (MVS)
- OGIS Communications Group, Inc. (OGIS)
- Panamerica Computers, Inc., dba PCITec (PCITec)
- Premier Technical Services Corporation (Premier)
- Silvereye Technologies, LLC (Silvereye)
- Storsoft Technology Corporation (Storsoft)
- WestWind Computer Products, Inc. (WestWind)
- WildFlower International, LTD (Wildflower)

The SEB reviewed each offeror's Management/Technical Approach proposal, reached consensus on findings; rated and scored each subfactor; applied the established numerical weights; and determined an overall Management/Technical Approach score for each proposal. In evaluating Past Performance, the SEB relied on performance data provided in the proposal and in Government past performance databases to determine whether each offeror's past performance was Acceptable or Unacceptable. Finally, the SEB analyzed

each offeror's proposed price to determine whether it was fair and reasonable. The primary tool utilized for price analysis was comparison of prices as described in FAR 15.404-1(b)(2)(i). Offerors' overall proposed total prices were compared against one another and the SEB reviewed outlying prices to ensure fairness and reasonableness.

The SEB completed its initial evaluation of proposals and documented its findings in written reports and a presentation to me on September 17, 2014. I made my original selection decision for Category B, Group B (HUBZone) on October 6, 2014. Following announcement of the selection, multiple unsuccessful offerors filed bid protests with the United States Government Accountability Office ("GAO") and with NASA. In response to these protests, NASA took corrective action by re-evaluating aspects of offerors' proposals under the Management/Technical Approach factor and the Price factor. This effort resulted in revised Management/Technical approach findings, updated ratings and scores, and revised price analysis documentation. On March 2, 2015, the SEB provided its revised written evaluation reports to me. On March 5, 2015, the SEB presented me an overview of its corrective action and its summary evaluation results.

MANAGEMENT/TECHNICAL APPROACH EVALUATION FACTOR

As described above, the SEB provided me with a detailed written report containing its findings. These findings are summarized below in order of offeror ranking, based on total Management/Technical Approach points, from high to low:

Wildflower International, Ltd.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Wildflower International's proposal as Very Good. Within this Subfactor, Wildflower International's proposal received the following findings: a Significant Strength for the full complement of all categories and substantial depth of product offerings in the Available Components Tab; and a Strength for proposed technology and accompanying analyst support across the scope of SEWP.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Wildflower International's proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Wildflower International's proposal received a Strength for a thorough approach to supply chain management that included risk analysis demonstrating insight into key supply chain issues.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Wildflower International's proposal as Good. Wildflower International did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Blue Tech, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Blue Tech's proposal as Very Good. Within this Subfactor, Blue Tech's proposal received a Significant Strength for the full complement of all categories and substantial depth of product offerings in the Available Components Tab.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Blue Tech's proposal as Good. Blue Tech did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Blue Tech's proposal as Good. Blue Tech did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Panamerica Computers, Inc. dba PCITec:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Panamerica Computers' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Panamerica Computers' proposal received the following findings: a Strength for the good depth and breadth of proposed Available Components; and a Strength for proposing a number of desirable features and product elements that exceed minimum requirements.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Panamerica Computers' proposal as Good. Panamerica Computers received a Strength for reducing supply chain risk both internally and through standards work.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Panamerica Computers' proposal as Good. Panamerica Computers did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

FedBiz IT Solutions, LLC:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated FedBiz IT Solutions' proposal as Very Good. Within this Subfactor, FedBiz IT Solutions' proposal received the following findings: a Strength for the good depth and breadth of proposed Available Components; a Strength for proposing a number of desirable features and product elements that exceed minimum requirements; and a Strength for its environmental and energy programs.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated FedBiz IT Solutions' proposal as Good. FedBiz IT Solutions did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated FedBiz IT Solutions' proposal as Good. FedBiz IT Solutions did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

WestWind Computer Products, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated WestWind Computer Products' proposal as Very Good. Within this Subfactor, WestWind Computer Products' proposal received a Significant Strength for the full complement of all categories and substantial depth of product offerings in the Available Components Tab.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated WestWind Computer Products' proposal as Good. WestWind Computer Products did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated WestWind Computer Products' proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, WestWind Computer Products' proposal received a Weakness for inadequately providing information regarding the reconciliation of its internal system with the SEWP database of record.

Premier Technical Services Corporation:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Premier Technical Services' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Premier Technical Services' proposal received a Strength for its proposed technology including use of engineering solutions and system engineering design and architecture.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Premier Technical Services' proposal as Good. Premier Technical Services did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Premier Technical Services' proposal as Good. Premier Technical Services did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Anacapa Micro Products, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Anacapa Micro Products' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Anacapa Micro Products' proposal received the following findings: a Strength for proposing a number of desirable features and product elements that exceed minimum requirements; a Strength for its demonstrated

technological leadership based on its in-house demonstration lab to simulate a customer's environment; and a Weakness for failing to adequately address capabilities in support of accessibility and energy conservation.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Anacapa Micro Products' proposal as Good. Anacapa Micro Products did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Anacapa Micro Products' proposal as Good. Anacapa Micro Products did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

BAHFed Corporation:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated BAHFed's proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, BAHFed's proposal received a Weakness for failing to adequately address capabilities in support of accessibility and energy conservation.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated BAHFed's proposal as Good. BAHFed did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated BAHFed's proposal as Good. BAHFed did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

4 Star Technologies:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated 4 Star Technologies' proposal as Good. 4 Star Technologies did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated 4 Star Technologies' proposal as Good. 4 Star Technologies did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated 4 Star Technologies' proposal as Fair. 4 Star Technologies' proposal received a Weakness for inadequately providing information on its planned program management approach to the contract.

Akira Technologies, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Akira Technologies' proposal as Good. Akira Technologies' proposal received the following findings: a Strength for proposed technology including a Cloud solution that enables a cost effective

on-premise private-hybrid cloud; and a Strength for proposing a number of desirable features and product elements that exceed minimum requirements.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Akira Technologies' proposal as Good. Akira Technologies did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Akira Technologies' proposal as Fair. Akira Technologies' proposal received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management approach, data interchange, and a problem resolution approach that reflects the unique characteristics of the SEWP Program.

OGIS Communications Group, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated OGIS Communications Group's proposal as Good. OGIS Communications Group received the following findings: a Strength for proposed technology including a Cloud solution that enables a cost effective on-premise private-hybrid cloud; and a Strength for proposing a number of desirable features and product elements that exceed minimum requirements.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated OGIS Communications Group's proposal as Good. OGIS Communications Group did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated OGIS Communications Group's proposal as Fair. OGIS Communications Group's proposal received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management approach, data interchange, and a problem resolution approach that reflects the unique characteristics of the SEWP Program.

Storsoft Technology Corp.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Storsoft Technology Corp.'s proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Storsoft Technology Corp.'s proposal received the following findings: a Strength for its proposed technology including a Cloud solution that enables a cost effective on-premise private-hybrid cloud; and for proposing a number of desirable features as identified in the RFP.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Storsoft Technology Corp.'s proposal as Good. Storsoft Technology Corp. did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Storsoft Technology Corp.'s proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Storsoft Technology Corp.'s proposal received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management approach, data interchange, and a problem resolution approach that reflects the unique characteristics of the SEWP Program.

Better Direct, LLC:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Better Direct's proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Better Direct's proposal received the following findings: a Weakness for its lack of a comprehensive narrative technical description beyond the technical aspects of the minimum mandatory items; and a Weakness for inadequately providing information on its capabilities in support of accessibility and energy conservation

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Better Direct's proposal as Fair. Better Direct's proposal received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its approach to augmentation of its vendor teaming relationships.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Better Direct's proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Better Direct's proposal received a Weakness for inadequately providing information on its planned management approach to the contract.

GovSmart, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated GovSmart's proposal as Good. GovSmart's proposal received a Weakness for failing to adequately address capabilities in support of accessibility and energy conservation.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated GovSmart's proposal as Fair. GovSmart's proposal received a Weakness for inadequately providing warranty information.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated GovSmart's proposal as Fair. GovSmart's proposal received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management, data interchange and catalog replication approach.

American 4G, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated American 4G's proposal as Fair. American 4G's proposal received the following findings: a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address accessibility, environmental, energy conservation, technology life cycle and software support and documentation; and a Weakness for its lack of a comprehensive narrative technical description beyond the technical aspects of the minimum mandatory items

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated American 4G's proposal as Fair. American 4G's proposal received the following findings: a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its ability to augment and enhance its vendor teaming relationships and implement procedures for supply chain risk reduction; and a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its post award support and service.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated American 4G's proposal as Fair. American 4G's proposal received a Weakness for inadequately providing information on its planned program management approach to the contract.

DH Technologies, LLC:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated DH Technologies' proposal as Fair. DH Technologies' proposal received the following findings: a Strength for proposing a number of desirable features and product elements that exceed minimum requirements; and a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address capabilities in support of accessibility and energy conservation.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated DH Technologies' proposal as Fair. DH Technologies' proposal received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its post award support and service.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated DH Technologies' proposal as Fair. DH Technologies' proposal received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management, data interchange and quality assurance approach.

Silvereye Technologies, LLC:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Silvereye Technologies' proposal as Fair. Silvereye Technologies' proposal received the following

findings: a Strength for proposing a number of desirable features and product elements that exceed minimum requirements; and a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address capabilities in support of accessibility and energy conservation.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Silvereye Technologies' proposal as Fair. Silvereye Technologies' proposal received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its post award support and service.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Silvereye Technologies' proposal as Fair. Silvereye Technologies' proposal received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management, data interchange and quality assurance approach.

MVS, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated MVS' proposal as Fair. MVS' proposal received the following findings: a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address accessibility, environmental, energy conservation, technology life cycle and software support and documentation; and a Weakness for its lack of a comprehensive narrative technical description beyond the technical aspects of the minimum mandatory items

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated MVS' proposal as Fair. MVS' proposal received a Weakness for inadequately providing information on its own policies and procedures to support the critical area of supply chain risk management; and a Weakness for inadequately providing information regarding post award support and service.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated MVS' proposal as Fair. MVS' proposal received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management, data interchange and quality assurance approach.

PRICE EVALUATION FACTOR

The SEB determined that each offeror in Category B, Group B (HUBZone) proposed a fair and reasonable price. The price differences among the proposals were primarily based on different product offerings provided by offerors to meet the minimum mandatory items that were specified in the RFP. The order of offerors' overall price, from high-to-low, is as follows:

Better Direct; BAHFed; GovSmart; 4 Star; Anacapa; Wildflower; American 4G; WestWind; Blue Tech; DH; Silvereye; MVS; Storsoft; OGIS; Akira; PCIT; FedBiz; and Premier.

PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FACTOR

The SEB determined that each offeror in Category B, Group B (HUBZone) had Acceptable Past Performance.

DECISION

Prior to the presentation, I reviewed the SEB's written evaluation reports for the Management/Technical Approach, Price, and Past Performance Factors. These reports were revised as part of the SEB's implementation of the corrective action. I understood the corrective action that the SEB took; the results of which were apparent to me when I read the revised evaluation reports. I noted fewer negative findings, resulting in improved ratings and scores. These reports replaced the SEB's original evaluation reports in their entirety and form the basis for my selection.

I carefully considered and understood the detailed Management/Technical Approach findings that the SEB documented as well as the resulting ratings and scores. I concluded that the SEB's revised evaluation of proposals was thorough and well-documented. Based on my review of the reports, the content of the presentation, and my discussions with the SEB and other NASA personnel present for the SEB's presentation, I generally agreed with the SEB's revised findings, adjectival ratings, and Management/Technical Approach scoring, as well as its evaluation results under the Price Factor. In limited instances, explained in detail below, my conclusions as to the degree of impact of certain findings on contract performance differed from the SEB's. Except as noted, I accepted the SEB's findings in their entirety.

During the presentation, I inquired as to the number of SEWP V contracts that would be necessary to support the anticipated volume of customers and orders under SEWP V, as well as the associated contract administration concerns or risks that may vary with the number of contract awards. The SEWP Program advised me that it had observed a notable increase in the volume, size, and complexity of orders, resulting in a significant need for additional product offerings and contractors under SEWP V. In addition, the SEWP Program indicated that the number of SEWP IV contractors is no longer sufficient to provide ample competition and responsiveness for the current volume of orders. Under SEWP IV, some task order competitions have had little or no competition, which is undesirable both for NASA and other Federal agency customers. Though a greater number of contractors would increase the administrative management burden on the SEWP Program, the benefits of increased competition, especially in the small business areas, outweighs the program management detriment in terms of the need for increased contract oversight. Therefore, the SEWP Program had planned for and favored a significant increase in contract awards under SEWP V. The SEWP Program anticipated

it could accommodate the increased oversight effort while retaining its agility and responsiveness to NASA and other Federal agency customers.

In reviewing the SEB's written evaluation reports, I noted that some of the lower-rated proposals within Group B (HUBZone) contained Significant Weaknesses. During the presentation, I questioned the SEB regarding the impact of these Significant Weaknesses. The SEB indicated the Significant Weaknesses it found for Group B (HUBZone) were based on inadequately detailed information in the proposals (e.g., inadequate information regarding post award support and service, inadequate explanation of planned management approach). I considered the SEB's explanation, assessing the performance risk associated with these findings in the multiple-award, IDIQ context. Based on this discussion, and my own review of the findings, I concluded in each instance that an offeror's failure to provide sufficient details about its approach, while a concern, is a lesser performance risk to NASA than an unsuitable or otherwise problematic Management/Technical approach. In terms of impact on SEWP V performance, weaknesses based on a lack of adequate information are distinguishable from those indicating a fundamental misunderstanding of the requirements or otherwise demonstrating an inability to perform the work.

Thus, while I agree with the SEB that Significant Weaknesses were appropriately assessed, I have determined that these offerors are viable as prospective SEWP contract holders despite providing proposals without adequate detail in certain areas. This is especially true given NASA's procurement objective to promote vendor competitiveness and provide access to a wide range of IT goods and services across the Federal Government. I considered that inclusion of these offerors in the SEWP V contract would increase the overall benefit to the Government by expanding the field of competition in the resulting task ordering process.

After considering the SEB's evaluation materials and the information discussed during the presentation, I deliberated as to which proposals to select for award. In making this determination, I referred to those portions of the RFP relevant to my selection decision. The RFP provided for a best value selection based on the stated relative order of importance of the evaluation factors. Past Performance was evaluated on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis and all offerors have Acceptable Past Performance. The two remaining factors, Management/Technical Approach and Price, were of approximately equal importance. I also noted that the RFP did not limit the total number of proposals that would be selected, but stated the Government's intent to make multiple awards within each competition group.


I carefully reviewed the acquisition objectives stated in the RFP and recognized the need for a multitude of contractors offering a wide range of products and services to ensure the Agency's acquisition objectives are met. I considered the appropriate number of awards to make, taking into account that a larger number of awards will result in a greater degree of available products and services and maximize price and technology competition to NASA and numerous other Government customers utilizing SEWP V to meet their IT needs. I concluded a large number of SEWP V contract awards will support the

Government's strategic decision making in meeting IT needs and promote vendor competitiveness.

Each proposal that was evaluated offered prices that the SEB determined to be fair and reasonable. I found the price differences among the proposals were primarily based on different product offerings that the offerors provided to meet the minimum mandatory items that were specified in the RFP. In reviewing the results of the SEB's evaluation under the Management/Technical Approach Factor, I noted that each proposal evaluated was responsive to the RFP requirements and received ratings of "Fair" or higher across all subfactors. Thus, after weighing the relative merit of each proposal under the Management/Technical Approach Factor and the Price Factor, and considering the appropriate number of awards to make to under this multiple-award contract, as outlined above, I concluded that each of the following offerors' proposals represented a best value to the Government:

4 Star; Akira; American 4G; Anacapa; BAHFed; Better Direct; Blue Tech; DH; FedBiz; GovSmart; MVS; OGIS; PCITec; Premier; Silvereye; Storsoft; WestWind; and Wildflower.

Accordingly, I have selected these offerors for award of a SEWP V contract within Category B, Group B (HUBZone).


Dennis C. Vander Tuig
Source Selection Authority


Date